```
J1m1jonc
1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                             18 Cr. 834 (PAE)
                 V.
5
      JAMEL JONES, KIFANO JORDAN,
6
                    Defendants.
                                             Curcio Hearing
           -----x
 7
 8
                                              New York, N.Y.
                                              January 22, 2019
9
                                              12:08 p.m.
10
     Before:
11
                         HON. PAUL A. ENGELMAYER,
12
                                              District Judge
13
14
                                APPEARANCES
15
     GEOFFREY S. BERMAN
          United States Attorney for the
          Southern District of New York
16
     BY: MICHAEL D. LONGYEAR
17
          JACOB E. WARREN
          Assistant United States Attorneys
18
19
      DIANE FERRONE, ESQ., Standing in For:
      DAWN M. CARDI, ESQ.
20
     CARDI & EDGAR LLP
          Attorneys for Defendant Jamel Jones
21
     LAW OFFICES OF JEFFREY LICHTMAN
          Attorneys for Defendant Kifano Jordan
22
     BY: JEFFREY B. EINHORN, ESQ.
23
24
     ALSO PRESENT: SCOTT E. LEEMON, ESQ.
25
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Case called)

MR. LONGYEAR: Good afternoon, your Honor. Michael Longyear and Jacob Warren on behalf of the United States.

THE COURT: Very good. Good afternoon to both of you.

And who do I have for Jamel Jones?

MS. FERRONE: Diane Ferrone standing in for Dawn Cardi. As your Honor is aware, Ms. Cardi is CJA counsel.

THE COURT: Very good. Good afternoon, Ms. Ferrone.

And Mr. Jones, good afternoon to you.

MR. LEEMON: And Scott Leemon here.

THE COURT: Yes. And Mr. Leemon, you are there as well. And you are hoping to represent Mr. Jones pending the outcome of this proceeding.

MR. LEEMON: Correct.

THE COURT: And who do I have for Mr. Jordan?

MR. EINHORN: Jeffrey Einhorn from the Law Offices of Jeffrey Lichtman. My partner is on trial, as your Honor may be aware, in the Eastern District.

THE COURT: Very well. Good afternoon to you, Mr. Einhorn. And good afternoon to you, Mr. Jordan.

DEFENDANT JORDAN: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: And good afternoon to all of the members of the public who are here. Welcome to all of you. Thank you for being here.

All right. This is a limited proceeding. It's only

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to take up a Curcio issue that has been taken up by the fact that Mr. Leemon, who is proposing to succeed Ms. Cardi and Ms. Ferrone as counsel, briefly represented Mr. Jordan. a series of questions that I want to put to each of the defendants one by one, but before I do that, I think it makes the most sense for me to take up with counsel what has happened since the flurry of orders that issued about this. most eager to do is get an understanding of the communications that have been had with your respective clients about the potential conflict and about whether to waive it or not. And the reason is, as all are aware, sometimes in these Curcio proceedings there's a two-step process in which first the client is made aware of the potential conflict and then they're given an opportunity to confer with conflict-free counsel about what to do about it. In this case, because I was given prompt notice of the issue and because it was going to be a little while before we could all meet, I thought it made sense for, if possible, the defendants to speak with what for each of them was an independent counsel already visible on the record to get that quidance.

So let me begin with you, Ms. Ferrone. You and Ms. Cardi were appointed as CJA counsel to represent Mr. Jones at the outset of this case.

MS. FERRONE: That's correct, your Honor. Ms. Cardiwas. I'm of counsel to Ms. Cardi.

24

25

```
1
              THE COURT: But you work with Ms. Cardi on this.
 2
              MS. FERRONE: Yes.
                                   So I have met with Mr. Jones as
 3
      well.
 4
               THE COURT: Move the mic closer.
 5
              You worked with Ms. Cardi on this representation.
              MS. FERRONE: Yes, your Honor.
6
 7
               THE COURT: Okay. And the representation here that's
      been made to me is that Mr. Leemon, for a brief period of time,
8
9
      represented Mr. Jordan, essentially the day the case was taken
10
      down, but almost immediately stepped aside in favor of
11
     Mr. Einhorn. Is that your understanding?
12
              MS. FERRONE: Yes, your Honor.
13
               I'm being told no, so --
14
               THE COURT: Sorry. I want you to sit down,
15
     Mr. Leemon. Let me just hear from the others. You're not yet
16
      in the case, Mr. Leemon.
17
               So let's get the facts. Mr. Einhorn, what happened?
              MR. EINHORN: I think it's a little bit more detailed
18
19
      than that. I think certainly Mr. Jordan was in the process of
20
      retaining us, but actually CJA counsel was appointed in the
21
     meantime. I believe it was Mr. Roth. So Mr. Leemon was
22
      initially his attorney and then Mr. Roth?
23
                      So again, it was Mr. Roth at first, then
```

Mr. Leemon, then Mr. Roth again, and then he retained my firm.

THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Einhorn, do you have an understanding of for how long it was that Mr. Leemon represented Mr. Jordan?

MR. EINHORN: I think technically just a few weeks, your Honor, but I believe there was only two meetings about the case, if that, and one of them I believe was on the day of his arrest.

MR. LEEMON: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. I think then, before we even go any further, I need to speak with Mr. Leemon then right now, because a few weeks is a radically different situation, which may present a more substantial problem.

Mr. Leemon, give me chapter and verse -- I don't want argument -- chapter and verse about your representation of Mr. Jordan.

MR. LEEMON: I received a call -- they were arrested right before Thanksgiving. I received a call during

Thanksgiving weekend -- I was down in Florida with my family -- asking me to come back to represent him.

THE COURT: "Him" is who?

MR. LEEMON: "Him" is Mr. Jordan.

THE COURT: Who did you get the call from?

MR. LEEMON: One of his family members.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LEEMON: I flew back, met with Mr. Jordan on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sunday before the Monday court appearance.

THE COURT: Where did you meet with Mr. Jordan?

MR. LEEMON: At MCC.

THE COURT: And at this point had Mr. Jordan been appointed CJA counsel?

MR. LEEMON: Mr. Roth had represented him at the initial appearance.

THE COURT: As CJA.

MR. LEEMON: As CJA counsel.

THE COURT: And you were being asked to come in as paid counsel.

MR. LEEMON: As retained counsel.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

THE COURT:

MR. LEEMON: I met with him briefly that day, briefly spoke generally about the indictment, explained to him what would happen at the status conference the next day; I appeared at the status conference the next day, and we had agreed on a retainer agreement and his family was supposed to send that. I did not get it that week. I think I met with him one other time right after to ask him what's going on. At that point I was informed that his family was debating who or what to hire, whether me or somebody else, and at that point I felt it probably made sense for me to file a motion to be relieved. At that point I reached out to the government and told them —

Sorry. At this point had you had any

entreaty on behalf of Mr. Jones? Had anyone from Mr. Jones reached out to you at this point?

MR. LEEMON: No.

THE COURT: All right. So in other words, at the time you're proposing to move to be relieved, you would have been absent from the case; there had been no suggestion to you that Mr. Jones might be interested in your services.

MR. LEEMON: Well, and then in between that time and me actually filing the motion, I received a call from one of Mr. Jones's family asking me if I could come into the case. At that point I reached out to the government and told the government that I had this inquiry and I was waiting to see what happened with Mr. Jordan, I was hoping Mr. Jordan was going to hire new counsel in between and it would have been an easy move, new counsel comes in, I get out, and then I could see what happens with the Joneses. I didn't know what was going to happen. At that point I didn't hear anything from the Jones family until after the new year.

THE COURT: So you don't know whether or not the Jones family is interested in your representation.

MR. LEEMON: At that point.

THE COURT: He's continued to be represented by Ms. Cardi and Ms. Ferrone.

MR. LEEMON: Correct.

THE COURT: And what's going on, though, with respect

to the Jordan representation?

MR. LEEMON: At that point I still had not filed my motion to be relieved. I waited to see if new counsel was hired. I then received an email from the government in mid to late December saying, make a decision, we need to figure out what's going on. At that point I filed the motion to be relieved.

THE COURT: And Mr. Roth had briefly represented

Mr. Jordan just for the purposes of the initial conference, but

you have appeared at this point soon thereafter for Mr. Jordan.

MR. LEEMON: Correct.

THE COURT: So Mr. Roth is out at that point.

MR. LEEMON: He's out. I filed the motion to be relieved. And after the reappointment to Roth -- because Mr. Jordan at that time had not figured out what he was doing and no one had entered an appearance on his behalf. So I told him, Mr. Roth had already been appointed; if there was going to be a lapse, let him represent him during that lapse.

THE COURT: And I grant that motion.

MR. LEEMON: Correct.

THE COURT: And so just give me the brackets of your representation dates of Mr. Jordan. What date to what date?

MR. LEEMON: Technically it was -- the initial court appearance was November 26, and I believe sometime in mid to late November, or December, is when I moved to be relieved. I

25

1	don't have the exact date.
2	THE COURT: So approximately a month.
3	MR. LEEMON: Approximately a month.
4	THE COURT: And how many times during that month,
5	first of all, did you meet in person with your client?
6	MR. LEEMON: I think three.
7	THE COURT: Tell me about those.
8	MR. LEEMON: First one was to discuss generally what's
9	going on.
10	THE COURT: That's at the MCC.
11	MR. LEEMON: At the MCC. All the meetings were at the
12	MCC.
13	THE COURT: But that's before the initial conference.
14	MR. LEEMON: That's before. I met with him then
15	shortly after, worked out the details, explained what happened.
16	THE COURT: Too blurry. You need to be
17	MR. LEEMON: Sorry. Shortly after the status
18	conference on the 26th, I would guess sometime that week.
19	THE COURT: When you say, we met about the details and
20	what happened, you need to be
21	MR. LEEMON: I explained what happened at the status
22	conference and I told him, we need to see the discovery, once
23	we have the discovery, we'll be able to have substantive talks
24	about the case against you.

THE COURT: And what's the third meeting?

25

1 MR. LEEMON: The third meeting was, I haven't heard back from the family what's going on. 2 3 THE COURT: That's also in person? 4 MR. LEEMON: In person. 5 THE COURT: Other than the in-person meetings, did you 6 have any electronic communications or phone communications with 7 Mr. Jordan? 8 MR. LEEMON: I do not believe so, no. I was not on 9 his email list. 10 THE COURT: All right. In any of those three meetings 11 did Mr. Jordan say anything to you -- and I don't want the 12 content, but did Mr. Jordan say anything to you about the facts 13 of this case? 14 MR. LEEMON: Nothing substantive; just general 15 conversation about the case. THE COURT: Did he say anything to you about 16 17 Mr. Jones? 18 MR. LEEMON: I told him that the Jones family had 19 reached out to me at one point. 20 THE COURT: I'm actually more interested in the facts 21 of the case. Did he say anything to you about --22 MR. LEEMON: No. 23 THE COURT: -- who Mr. Jones was or any relationship 24 he had with Mr. Jones?

MR. LEEMON: Nothing specific, no.

1	THE COURT: What about anything in general?
2	MR. LEEMON: Just he's part of the case against us.
3	Just talking about
4	THE COURT: He's part of the case against us?
5	MR. LEEMON: I'm sorry. We did have one discussion,
6	just asking what everyone's role, who's been indicted, how he
7	knew them.
8	THE COURT: Okay. So you asked him how he knew
9	Mr. Jones?
10	MR. LEEMON: Correct.
11	THE COURT: And without telling me his answer, he
12	answered that question to you?
13	MR. LEEMON: He did.
14	THE COURT: At what length did his answer go?
15	MR. LEEMON: General.
16	THE COURT: Less than ten words?
17	MR. LEEMON: Yes.
18	THE COURT: Other than that, did Mr. Jones's name, in
19	your memory, come up at all in your communications with
20	Mr. Jordan?
21	MR. LEEMON: No.
22	THE COURT: Did you review any discovery that was
23	particular to Mr. Jordan?
24	MR. LEEMON: Absolutely not, and I have provided
25	Mr. Einhorn with the DVDs that were turned over. I never even

J1m1jonc 1 downloaded them. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MR. EINHORN: We'll acknowledge receipt, your Honor. 4 We did receive them. 5 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Leemon, anything else 6 factual to proffer to me? 7 MR. LEEMON: I don't think there's anything else. THE COURT: And you of course have not commenced your 8 9 representation of Mr. Jones because you haven't been --10 MR. LEEMON: Officially appointed. 11 THE COURT: -- officially appointed, and you've held 12 off reviewing Jones's discovery or counseling Mr. Jones or his 13 family pending your appointment, is that correct? 14 MR. LEEMON: I have not offered anything of substance. 15 I had a couple of meetings with him. We did not discuss 16 anything, except for the fact we were going to appear here, 17 your Honor. 18 THE COURT: So the only discussions you've had with him have involved the conflict issue, correct? 19 20 MR. LEEMON: Correct, and told him that initially, before you issued that order, I had an appointment with the 21 22 government to go over the discovery, and we stopped that

THE COURT: For future reference, I shouldn't have had to issue that order. If there's a *Curcio* issue, you need to

pending the resolution of the --

23

24

25

Stop work. You need to not start work pending the appointment. Otherwise there's a risk of soiling the nest for everybody if a conflicted lawyer is rooting around doing stuff without court approval. So for future reference, in federal court, these niceties really matter. So I'm glad you didn't do any work, but I shouldn't have had to tell you that, okay?

MR. LEEMON: All right.

THE COURT: So with that, let's go back then to you,

Ms. Ferrone. Does Mr. Leemon's account of the facts align with

what your understanding had been coming into this hearing?

MS. FERRONE: Yes, that's correct, your Honor. I think that after your Honor issued the order on January 11th of 2019, Ms. Cardi visited in person at the MCC with Mr. Jones on the following day, January 12th, the Saturday, where they discussed the potential for conflict, Mr. Leemon's brief representation of Mr. Jordan, and Mr. Jones indicated that to the extent there was a conflict, he was willing to waive it and go forward with Mr. Leemon.

THE COURT: Okay. Were you present for that meeting?

MS. FERRONE: I was not, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you had any meetings with your client, Mr. Jones, about the *Curcio* issue?

MS. FERRONE: I have not, your Honor.

THE COURT: In what detail did Ms. Cardi recount to you -- I understand she's unavailable, and I authorized your

standing in for her, but I want to make sure that you're in a position to proffer to me about Ms. Cardi's meetings with your client.

MS. FERRONE: Other than that one meeting on

January 12th, which she provided the details of to me, in broad

strokes, that's the extent of which I can inform the Court.

THE COURT: Did she convey to you that she felt that Mr. Jones understood the nature of the potential conflict?

MS. FERRONE: Yes, she did.

THE COURT: Did she convey to you that Mr. Jones understood that he had a right to decline to agree to proceed with counsel who harbored a potential conflict?

MS. FERRONE: Yes.

THE COURT: Did she feel that Mr. Jones got it, that he understood the nature of the conflict and the right that he had not to proceed with anything other than a conflict-free counsel?

MS. FERRONE: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. And Ms. Cardi is obviously well known to me as a very respected member of the CJA panel. Her word counts a lot. She was unequivocal in so representing all that to you?

MS. FERRONE: Yes, very much so, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Very good. Let's turn then to Mr. Einhorn, as to your conversations with Mr. Jordan. Before

I ask you about that, does Mr. Leemon's account of the facts align with your understanding about what his representation had been of what is now your client, Mr. Jordan?

MR. EINHORN: Yes, your Honor. It aligns with my understanding of the situation that occurred.

THE COURT: And how do you come in for Mr. Roth? In other words, as I understand it, Mr. Roth is there at the initial conference, Mr. Leemon takes over for a month or so, Mr. Leemon withdraws, I appointed Mr. Roth. How did you get into this situation?

MR. EINHORN: I think I can make it somewhat simple. We were initially contacted about Mr. Jordan's arrest sometime in -- I believe it was the beginning of December, and spoke with the family about potentially coming into the case. And it took the family some time to be able to retain us. We had met with Mr. Jordan twice at that time but were not coming into the case until they were able to retain us. We didn't actually hear back from them for some time, and then were not firmly retained by them until just last week, at which point I went to see Mr. Jordan and we discussed the *Curcio* issue and any potential conflict that may exist.

THE COURT: All right. So you were retained last week, substituting Mr. Roth.

MR. EINHORN: That's correct.

THE COURT: The lawyer who conferred with Mr. Jordan,

the independent lawyer with respect to the *Curcio* issue, was Mr. Roth or you or both?

MR. EINHORN: It was me, your Honor, but I believe Mr. Roth also counseled Mr. Jordan, and we discussed the situation and his understanding from what Mr. Jordan wants to do and what occurred were aligned.

THE COURT: So let's talk about your conversations with Mr. Jordan. To begin with, what I think you just indicated is that what Mr. Leemon described aligns with what you understood the facts to be at the time you met with your client?

MR. EINHORN: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: How much time did you spend with Mr. Jordan discussing the *Curcio* situation and his rights?

MR. EINHORN: I would say approximately one hour.

THE COURT: And when was that?

MR. EINHORN: This past Thursday.

THE COURT: Okay. And tell me more about that conversation.

MR. EINHORN: We discussed any potential conflict of interest that may exist with regard to Mr. Leemon's previous representation of Mr. Jordan, we discussed the contents of their meetings, the number of meetings, the length of their meetings, and what, if any, details were discussed concerning Mr. Jones or anybody else.

24

25

THE COURT: Were you left with the same understanding 1 that Mr. Leemon conveyed, that essentially there was nothing of 2 3 substance that Mr. Jordan conveyed to Mr. Leemon either 4 generally about the case or specifically about Mr. Jones? 5 MR. EINHORN: That's correct, your Honor. 6 understanding as well. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Leemon represented that he recalls a very short back-and-forth along the lines of who's Mr. Jones 8 9 and Mr. Jordan gave an answer that, in response to my question, 10 Mr. Leemon feels is unlikely to be more than ten words. 11 that in line with the understanding you took away from your 12 client? 13 MR. EINHORN: That's my takeaway as well, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. And in your view, did 15 Mr. Jordan understand that he has a right to conflict-free counsel, he can insist on Mr. Leemon not taking over the Jones 16 17 representation? 18 MR. EINHORN: He understands that, and he indicated to me that he would waive for these purposes today. 19 20 THE COURT: All right. And you're confident he 21 understood his rights. 22 MR. EINHORN: Yes, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: All right. Government, before I take up

questions going one by one with the two defendants, is there

any additional background, in the interest of protecting the

record here, making sure that we have a satisfactory *Curcio* examination, any of the background you want me to try to elicit about the facts?

MR. LONGYEAR: No, your Honor. But to clarify just briefly about Mr. Roth's involvement --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. LONGYEAR: -- on November 19th was the initial presentment, and at that point Judge Pitman, upon reviewing the financial affidavit from Mr. Jordan, determined that he was not eligible for CJA and therefore appointed Mr. Roth for presentment only.

THE COURT: I see. So he was going to have to get substituted.

MR. LONGYEAR: That's correct. So that's the 19th.

I think on the 25th then Mr. Leemon comes in and is in for the 26th, the conference was on November 26th, and then I believe your Honor, I want to say it was around December 23rd, somewhere around then is when your Honor signed, so ordered Mr. Leemon's letter requesting that he be relieved, and at that point was when Mr. Roth was then appointed for Mr. Jordan. So I don't want to speak to Mr. Roth because he and I haven't had substantive conversations about what was discussed, but I just want to make clear that Mr. Roth technically wasn't representing Mr. Jordan. He was only appointed at that initial presentment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Understood. All right. Thank you. Very helpful.

Let me just come back to you, Mr. Einhorn. I covered your discussions with Mr. Jordan. Did Mr. Roth make any representations to you about his discussions with Mr. Jordan about the *Curcio* issue?

MR. EINHORN: He indicated to me that they discussed the issue and they had gone back and forth on it, and his takeaway was similar to mine and similar to Mr. Leemon's as well.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Very good.

If nobody has any additional questions, I'm going to proceed to question first Mr. Jones. But Mr. Jordan, I will ask you to play close attention because some of the questions that I ask Mr. Jones will be similar, so it will help you get up to speed.

Mr. Smallman, will you kindly swear Mr. Jones.

(Defendant Jones sworn)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Jones, how old are you?

DEFENDANT JONES: Thirty-eight.

THE COURT: You can sit down. It's fine with me.

Just speak into the mic so everyone can hear you.

What education have you received?

DEFENDANT JONES: Twelfth grade.

THE COURT: Where was that?

1	DEFENDANT JONES: John Jay High School.
2	THE COURT: All right. And are you currently under a
3	doctor's care or taking any medication?
4	DEFENDANT JONES: No, sir.
5	THE COURT: No?
6	DEFENDANT JONES: No, sir.
7	THE COURT: All right. Very good.
8	In the past 24 hours have you taken any drugs,
9	alcohol, or anything that could impair your ability to
10	understand?
11	DEFENDANT JONES: No, sir.
12	THE COURT: Is there anything today that's interfering
13	with your ability to understand what's happening?
14	DEFENDANT JONES: No, sir.
15	THE COURT: Your mind is clear?
16	DEFENDANT JONES: Yes.
17	THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Leemon, is it your view
18	that Mr. Jones is of a clear mind today?
19	MR. LEEMON: Absolutely. I met with him before court
20	and he's clear.
21	THE COURT: And Ms. Ferrone, same?
22	MS. FERRONE: Yes, your Honor.
23	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Jones, to the extent you
24	had conversations with Mr. Leemon, are you satisfied with his
25	work and services so far?

2.2

DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Has Mr. Leemon in fact informed you that at one point he represented your co-defendant Mr. Jordan?

DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the fact that Mr. Leemon at one point represented Mr. Jordan and had conversations of some sort with him that are likely covered by attorney-client privilege, that those could lead Mr. Leemon in some circumstance to have divided loyalties between you and Mr. Jordan?

DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And let me give you some examples of ways, at least in theory, that Mr. Leemon's privileged conversations with Mr. Jordan could adversely affect his representation of you. And let me make something clear.

Mr. Leemon, please don't pass that notepad. You're not even counsel yet. If you're passing notes, why don't you sit in back. You're not his counsel yet, and I can't tell you how offensive it is that I'm in the middle of a *Curcio* hearing and the lawyer who's subject to the conflict is passing notes to the client. Go sit in the back. I'm sorry. But, you know, this is federal court.

Ms. Ferrone, why don't you go sit next to your client.

MS. FERRONE: Sure.

THE COURT: Look, Mr. Jones, I'm not in any way

representing to you that in point of fact any of these conflict issues could come home to roost. My job is just to make sure you're aware of the possibilities. I've certainly heard what Mr. Leemon represented, and if it's as described, it sounds very likely like a nonissue, but it's possible there's more there than any of us remember, that he remembers, and so I need to ask you these questions. Don't infer from my questions that I'm making a judgment that there is a problem here. I'm simply being neutral in describing a few possibilities. Do you understand that?

DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. So Mr. Jones, these are ways in which Mr. Leemon's privileged conversations with Mr. Jordan could potentially adversely affect his representation of you.

First of all, are you aware that Mr. Leemon could possibly have information from Mr. Jordan that would be helpful in defending you but that he would be absolutely prohibited from using it to defend you because of the attorney-client privilege?

DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Similarly, do you understand that were this case to proceed to trial, and if Mr. Jordan were to testify, Mr. Leemon might have information to cross-examine Mr. Jordan but he would be prohibited from using it because it's protected by the attorney-client privilege? Do you

understand that?

DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. I need to make sure you understand in your own words what the potential conflict is here. Can you put it in your own words to me?

DEFENDANT JONES: Maybe -- like maybe when they spoke, that whatever, whatever information that he -- that he got from Kifano Jones, that he can't use to help me down the line.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. And do you understand that apart from what you've just described, apart from the two situations that I've described, one danger is that we may not be able to foresee all the possible conflicts here; in other words, there's a possibility that there may be some other conflict that none of us can quite imagine right now that arises because Mr. Leemon had privileged conversations with Mr. Jordan and they might in some way limit his ability to represent you? Do you understand there's a possibility that there's something else out there that none of us have spotted?

DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you understand that in every criminal case, including yours, a defendant is entitled to assistance of counsel whose loyalty to him is undivided, who's not subject to any factor that might in any way intrude upon an attorney's loyalty to his interests?

DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir.

25

THE COURT: And in other words, do you understand that 1 you are entitled to an attorney who has your interests alone, 2 3 only your interests in mind and not the interests of anyone 4 else, not the interests of any other client? 5 DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, I do. 6 THE COURT: That's your right; you understand that. 7 DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir. 8 THE COURT: Has anyone given you any inducement or any 9 promise or any threat with respect to your choice of counsel? 10 DEFENDANT JONES: No, sir. 11 THE COURT: Have you consulted with any attorneys 12 other than Mr. Leemon, such as Ms. Cardi, about the issues 13 presented by this potential conflict of interest? 14 DEFENDANT JONES: You say any other lawyer? 15 THE COURT: Yes. Like did you speak with Ms. Cardi? 16 DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: How long did you spend with Ms. Cardi on 18 this subject? 19 DEFENDANT JONES: About 30, 40 minutes. 20 THE COURT: Okay. And do you feel, coming away from 21 that conversation, you understood the potential conflict of 2.2 interest here? 23 DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir. 24 THE COURT: All right. And do you understand that you

had a right to confer with Ms. Cardi about that and if you want

more time, I'll give you an opportunity to speak again with her or with Ms. Ferrone, if there's any aspects of the information that I've conveyed to you today that you want to discuss with an attorney who is free of a conflict? Do you understand that?

DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. I'm prepared, if you want, to adjourn the rest of this proceeding as to you if you'd like more time to consult with an attorney about the potential conflict of interests that I've described, and if it were to turn out that you couldn't afford a lawyer to consult with, I would be glad to appoint somebody. I think realistically, I would ask Ms. Cardi to continue on, and Ms. Ferrone, because they're as able as anyone to handle this. But the point is that I would give you more time to speak with them if you'd like. Would you prefer to adjourn so you can give more time or thought to this matter, or are you prepared to decide now?

DEFENDANT JONES: I'm prepared to decide now.

THE COURT: All right. After considering everything
I've said to you about the ways in which Mr. Leemon's prior
representation of Mr. Jordan may adversely affect your defense,
do you believe that it's in your best interests to continue
with him as your attorney?

DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. And more precisely, do you want me to appoint him, to authorize his substitution as your

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

J1m1jonc attorney? I don't need to appoint him. He's a retained counsel. But I need to clear his representation as against the potential conflict. It is your wish that I do so. DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir. THE COURT: All right. And do you understand that by choosing to have Mr. Leemon as your attorney, you're waiving your right to be represented solely by an attorney who has no conflict of interest? DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir. THE COURT: All right. And you're knowingly and voluntarily waiving your right to conflict-free representation?

DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And do you agree to waive any postconviction argument -- meaning if you're convicted at a trial in this case, do you agree to waive any postconviction argument, on appeal or otherwise, that by virtue of Mr. Leemon's prior representation of Mr. Jordan and his representation now of you, you were denied effective assistance of counsel by Mr. Leemon? You agree to forgo that argument? DEFENDANT JONES: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything that I've said that you wish to have explained further?

DEFENDANT JONES: No, sir.

THE COURT: All right. I have listened closely to Mr. Jones, and I am firmly persuaded that he understands his

J1m1jonc right to conflict-free counsel and has knowingly and 1 2 voluntarily waived it. 3 We now need to take up the same issues with 4 Mr. Jordan, but I certainly am persuaded that there is a 5 satisfactory waiver here as it relates to Mr. Jones. 6 I should ask the government whether you have any 7 different view. 8 MR. LONGYEAR: No, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: All right. And counsel, I take it you're 10 in agreement as well. 11 MS. FERRONE: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Then let's turn to Mr. Jordan. 13 Mr. Smallman, would you kindly swear Mr. Jordan. 14 (Defendant Jordan sworn) 15 THE COURT: All right. You may be seated. 16

Mr. Jordan, how old are you?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DEFENDANT JORDAN: I'm 36 years old, your Honor.

THE COURT: And what education have you received?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: High school education.

THE COURT: Where was that?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: George Westinghouse High School.

THE COURT: Where is that?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: In Brooklyn.

THE COURT: Okay. And are you currently taking any medication or under a doctor's care?

24

25

his representation of you?

1 DEFENDANT JORDAN: No, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: In the past 24 hours have you taken any 3 alcohol, had any alcohol or drugs or taken anything that could 4 impair your ability to understand or make yourself heard? 5 DEFENDANT JORDAN: No, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Is your mind clear today? 7 DEFENDANT JORDAN: Yes, sir, your Honor. THE COURT: Anything interfering with your ability to 8 9 understand what's happening here today? 10 DEFENDANT JORDAN: No, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: And Mr. Einhorn, are you satisfied that 12 your client is of a clear mind today? 13 MR. EINHORN: I am, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Jordan, do you understand 15 that the fact that Mr. Leemon once represented you and likely had conversations with you that are covered by the 16 17 attorney-client privilege, that all that could lead to divided 18 loyalty by Mr. Leemon as between you and Mr. Jones if he takes 19 on the representation of Mr. Jones? 20 DEFENDANT JORDAN: Yes, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Do you understand that were the case to 22 proceed to trial, and you testified at trial, Mr. Leemon could 23 potentially cross-examine you and, in the process, in some way

potentially exploit confidences that he learned from you during

1

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And tell me in your own words what your understanding is of the potential conflict of interest that

DEFENDANT JORDAN: Yes, your Honor.

would occur if Mr. Leemon is allowed now to represent

5 Mr. Jones.

DEFENDANT JORDAN: If we did have any conversations about the case prior to him representing Mr. Jones, that it could affect us at trial, somewhere down the line.

THE COURT: In what way?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: Either in a negative or positive way.

THE COURT: Right. But in other words, just concretely, just explain to me how that could hurt you. Like in what potential way? How could it hurt you?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: If me and him spoke in any way, he might be able to bring it up in open court, cross-examine me, whatever.

THE COURT: Okay. Same questions I asked Mr. Jones.

Do you understand in every criminal case, including yours, the defendant is entitled to assistance of counsel whose loyalty to him is undivided, who is not subject to any factor that might in any way intrude upon an attorney's loyalty to his interests?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: Yes, I understand.

THE COURT: You understand that you're entitled to have an attorney who has only your interests in mind and not

the interests of any other client.

J1m1jonc

DEFENDANT JORDAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And have you received any inducement, promise, or threat with regard to your decision whether or not to waive the right to conflict-free counsel so as to help allow Mr. Leemon to represent Mr. Jones?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Have you consulted with independent counsel, somebody other than Mr. Leemon, about the dangers to you presented by the potential conflict of interest?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: Yes, I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Who have you consulted with?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: Mr. Einhorn and Mr. Roth.

THE COURT: Do you feel you spent enough time with them to understand your rights here?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: About how much time did you spend with each of them?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: Combined, maybe over -- about an hour and 40 minutes combined.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you understand that you have a right to do just that, you have a right to consult with attorneys who don't have any conflict of interest, and that I'll give you an opportunity to continue those conversations if there's anything that you want to follow up with? Do you

understand that?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And I'm prepared to adjourn the remainder of this proceeding so that you can continue your conversation with Mr. Einhorn, or if you wanted to go back to see Mr. Roth, I'm happy for you to do that if you'd like to. Would you prefer that I adjourn until you can give more thought to this matter, or are you prepared to decide today?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: I'm prepared to decide today, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And are you knowingly and voluntarily waiving your right to conflict-free representation?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: Yes, I am, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you agree to waive any postconviction argument, on appeal or otherwise, that by virtue of Mr. Leemon's earlier representation of you and his upcoming representation of Mr. Jones, that you were denied effective assistance of counsel?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything that I have said that you'd like to have explained further?

DEFENDANT JORDAN: No, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Government counsel, do you disagree that Mr. Jordan has given a knowing and voluntary waiver of his right to conflict-free counsel?

1 MR. LONGYEAR: No, we do not disagree. THE COURT: Defense counsel, any disagreement? 2 3 MR. EINHORN: No disagreement, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: As with Mr. Jones, I find that Mr. Jordan 5 has knowingly and voluntarily waived his right to conflict-free counsel. So with that, I will authorize Mr. Leemon's 6 7 representation, effective immediately, of Mr. Jones. that both defendants have knowingly and voluntarily waived 8 9 their right to conflict-free counsel. 10 Ms. Ferrone, I take it that means that you and 11 Ms. Cardi are, effectively immediately, relieved. 12 MS. FERRONE: Yes, your Honor. We'll not be at the 13 2 p.m. conference. 14 THE COURT: No. I believe it's 2:30. 15 MS. FERRONE: 2:30, right. THE COURT: Yes. And will you please make sure, on 16 17 behalf of yourself and Ms. Cardi, to promptly effect a full 18 knowledge transfer to Mr. Leemon. You've been at this case now since mid/late November. To the extent you have discovery, to 19 20 the extent you have interviews, to the extent you have work 21 product, please promptly make it available to Mr. Leemon so 22 that he can hit the ground running. 23 MS. FERRONE: Absolutely, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: All right. And government, would you 25 please make sure that Mr. Leemon has whatever discovery letters

or other correspondence you've issued so that he is in a position to determine that he is in fact in possession of all correspondence and Rule 16 discovery from the government.

MR. LONGYEAR: Yes, your Honor, and one point on that. There is a protective order in this case. Mr. Leemon had signed it on behalf of Mr. Jordan. Mr. Einhorn and Mr. Lichtman are now in for Mr. Jordan. So I guess my question for your Honor is, how would you like us to address that protective order? Is it enough that they're aware of it and —

THE COURT: I think they ought to sign it, but just so Mr. Leemon may now get in on the case, Mr. Leemon may now come forward.

Mr. Leemon, do you understand that the protective order that you once issued as to Mr. Jordan equally applies to you in your representation of Mr. Jones?

MR. LEEMON: I do.

THE COURT: I'll ask you, when the government gets you the new version, to sign it, but so that you can get out of the gate quickly without delay, do you understand that per this conversation, you're bound by those same terms in your representation of Mr. Jones?

MR. LEEMON: I do.

THE COURT: All right. Very good.

All right. Before we break, Mr. Leemon, am I correct that you disrupted your travel plans to come here today?

25

MR. LEEMON: I did. 1 2 Where were you going? THE COURT: 3 MR. LEEMON: I was supposed to be in Jamaica, your 4 Honor. 5 THE COURT: All right. I want to just give a shoutout to you, because while I was a little tart with you a moment ago 6 7 for passing notes with your future client during a colloquy; it's also the case that you did something very noble, which is 8 9 to disrupt your own travel plans to get here so that you could 10 start your representation earlier. I have great respect for 11 that. I hope it didn't inconvenience you and your family too 12 much, but I'm grateful for your dedication to Mr. Jones that 13 you did that. 14 Mr. Jones, you have a dedicated lawyer. 15 Yes. 16 MR. EINHORN: Judge, just one more thing before we 17 break, before the 2:30. I was only recently informed of this, 18 but there actually is another Curcio issue that's not been 19 explored as of yet, and that is that Mr. Hernandez, who has 20 Mr. Lazzaro as his attorney, previously represented my client, 21 actually at trial once and I believe in two other cases as 22 well. I wanted to get that before the Court. 23 THE COURT: That was at a trial? 24 MR. EINHORN: At a trial. He was his lawyer at a

trial, I believe in Brooklyn?

24

25

represented.

1 DEFENDANT JORDAN: Yes, sir. MR. EINHORN: I was only briefly made aware of it. 2 Ι 3 wanted to get it before the Court as soon as possible. 4 THE COURT: When did you become aware of this? 5 MR. EINHORN: Just on Thursday, Judge, when I met with Mr. Jordan. 6 7 THE COURT: Is there some reason why I'm learning of this now as opposed to later on Thursday? 8 9 MR. EINHORN: Your Honor, I left the state after I met 10 with Mr. Jordan. 11 THE COURT: No, but the internet didn't leave you. 12 there some reason you didn't tell the government or find a way 13 to alert my chambers? For heaven's sake, that's five days ago. 14 It would have been better for all of us to know it. 15 MR. EINHORN: I apologize to the Court, your Honor. Ι did want the opportunity to discuss the matter again with 16 17 Mr. Jordan to find out exactly the details. He couldn't 18 remember everything. We did sit here, we talked about it 19 before your Honor came out again, but there is certainly an 20 issue. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Hernandez represented Mr. Jordan at 22 some point. 23 MR. EINHORN: No, no, no, no. Mr. Lazzaro

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Mr. Lazzaro. Right.

```
1
     Mr. Lazzaro, who is the current lawyer for --
 2
               MR. EINHORN: Mr. Hernandez, Daniel Hernandez.
 3
               THE COURT: -- once represented --
 4
               MR. EINHORN: My client.
 5
               THE COURT: In what sort of matter?
 6
               MR. EINHORN: He was his attorney in I believe three
 7
      criminal cases.
               DEFENDANT JORDAN: Yes, sir.
8
9
               MR. EINHORN: And one was taken to trial.
10
               THE COURT: And what did they relate to? What were
11
      the facts? What were the charges?
12
               MR. EINHORN: If I can have just a brief second, your
13
      Honor.
14
               THE COURT: Yes, take a moment.
15
               (Mr. Einhorn conferring with Defendant Jordan)
16
               MR. EINHORN: Hence why we need to discuss it again,
17
      your Honor. So there was a reckless endangerment trial, and
18
     Mr. Jordan was acquitted at that trial, and he was represented
      by Mr. Lazzaro. He said there were two other cases as well.
19
20
      He could not remember the details of those cases. I was
21
      hopeful that by now we would have a little bit more information
22
      so we could try and pull the records and at least get
23
      something.
24
               THE COURT: Have you tried to pull the records?
25
               MR. EINHORN: We contacted the court for the
```

24

25

information but we didn't get it yet. It's very difficult for 1 defense attorneys actually to get rap sheets for clients and 2 3 work backwards. We get everything from the government usually. 4 THE COURT: When did you first tell the government 5 about this potential conflict? 6 MR. EINHORN: Only now, Judge. 7 THE COURT: You mean only in front of me. MR. EINHORN: Only in front of you. 8 9 Your Honor, and just in realtime, I'm only hearing 10 about something now as well, and that's Mr. Lazzaro represented 11 another defendant in this case, Faheem Walter. 12 THE COURT: Currently represents him on the state? 13 MR. EINHORN: He's presently representing him on a 14 state case, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I'm confused. Mr. Lazzaro 16 also represented who? 17 MR. EINHORN: Faheem Walter, who is a defendant in 18 this case, and, at least according to my client, is still 19 representing him on a state case. 20 THE COURT: What's that case about? 21 (Mr. Einhorn conferring with Defendant Jordan) 22 MR. EINHORN: It's an assault case, your Honor, 23 related to a shooting. I apologize. That's all the

THE COURT: All right. Look, I appreciate your

information I have at this point.

bringing it to my attention, but if it isn't apparent, I'm less than satisfied with the speed by which the government and I are being told of this. I mean, I've got a conference in this case at 2:30. For heaven's sake, I mean, you knew that I was scheduling the *Curcio* hearing as to the issue here to get it done before that conference. You're sitting on this information. I'm glad you got to go out of state, but meanwhile you've messed up this 2:30 conference. We could have either put over the conference or at least tried to gather facts as to the *Curcio* to make sense of all this.

And have you spoken, for example, to Mr. Lazzaro about the issue?

MR. EINHORN: I have not yet.

THE COURT: So in other words, except for talking to your client and then going away for the long weekend, you've done nothing.

MR. EINHORN: I spoke with the client, I spoke with my partner as well. We discussed the matter. We were both hopeful we would get more information from Mr. Jordan as to the details. Doesn't sound like he remembered a lot more from then to now. We were hopeful he would so that there would be more we could go forward with with regard to a *Curcio* hearing, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Look, I will ask you to meet with the government promptly after we adjourn today to give

them the benefit of everything you know. Interview your client as much as possible. But as I understand it, really, it's Mr. Walter and Mr. Jordan who were the clients in these prior Lazzaro representations.

MR. EINHORN: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: And so playing this out, I think I can figure it out, but articulate for me the potential conflicts presented by a Lazzaro representation in the past of your client, let's say.

(Defendant Jordan conferring with his counsel)

MR. EINHORN: Just generally, your Honor, for instance, if my client were to testify and Mr. Lazzaro were to examine my client in some way, he could use that information against him. My understanding is that there was a discussion potentially that revolved around this case as well; without getting into any details or breaking any confidentiality, that there was a discussion about that. Certainly that could be used against my client as well.

THE COURT: In terms of an issue for cross-examination.

MR. EINHORN: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. And although I realize you're not party to all this, same theory would presumably apply to

Mr. Walter, that there would be a concern that at trial there would be some knowledge of the prior client that would inform

cross-examination.

MR. EINHORN: That would be my understanding, your Honor. I don't represent Mr. Walter, of course.

THE COURT: Yes, yes. Do you understand that any of the charges on which Mr. Lazzaro represented your client are connected in any way to the charges or the organization that is identified in the indictment?

MR. EINHORN: Without revealing client confidences, your Honor, I think that to be more clear, there was an inquiry and a discussion with Mr. Lazzaro that would have been connected after representation concluded in his final case.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I don't follow what you're saying.

MR. EINHORN: Okay. Mr. Lazzaro represented my client, and then afterwards, there was a discussion concerning something related to this case that occurred between my client and Mr. Lazzaro. So he didn't seek to retain him for that case, but he had a longstanding relationship with this attorney and then he contacted this attorney and there was a discussion.

THE COURT: And your understanding is that the discussion between your client and Mr. Lazzaro, even though it wasn't in connection with a pending charge, somehow discussed some of the conduct that is, let us say, alleged in the indictment.

MR. EINHORN: I don't know that I would want to say

conduct because that might be too specific, but certainly the organization itself, the alleged organization.

THE COURT: Right. Okay. Look, I will ask you to be as transparent as you can with the government, consistent with attorney-client privilege, so that they're in a position to work through what are always a complicated set of issues, made more complicated by our pending 2:30. I suppose I will need to put on the record at the 2:30 conference the fact that, as if out of nowhere, a *Curcio* issue came up here and that I will be asking government counsel and counsel for the affected defendants to promptly confer about the right way to address the *Curcio*.

MR. EINHORN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Government, anything?

MR. LONGYEAR: Just, Mr. Hernandez is also represented by Ms. Dawn Florio, and I guess we should ask now if there are any issues there as well.

THE COURT: That's a nice question. Is Ms. Florio, to your knowledge, affiliated at the same firm as Mr. Lazzaro?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ LONGYEAR: Not to the government's knowledge, your Honor, no.

THE COURT: Did Ms. Florio represent your client --

MR. EINHORN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- Mr. Einhorn?

MR. EINHORN: No, your Honor.

```
THE COURT: And let's just have it out. Ask your
1
 2
      client if Ms. Florio ever represented anyone else in this case.
 3
               MR. EINHORN: He seems to know a lot.
 4
               (Mr. Einhorn conferring with Defendant Jordan)
 5
               MR. EINHORN: No, your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: I think that's a very smart question the
 7
      government has identified, because in the hands of an
      independent lawyer such as Florio, that helps some, but the
8
9
      representation by Mr. Lazzaro obviously presents sort of
10
      cross-examination issues with respect to Mr. Jordan that I
      understand.
11
               All right. Government, you've got some thinking to do
12
13
      as to how to sort out the swirl of issues here.
14
               In any event, I'll see you all at 2:30. Thank you,
15
      all.
16
               One moment. Mr. Smallman, where is the 2:30?
17
               THE DEPUTY CLERK:
                                  318.
18
               THE COURT: Courtroom 318, not here. All right.
                                                                  See
19
      you at courtroom 318. Thank you.
20
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
21
                                    000
22
23
24
25
```